

Perturbative Unification and Low Energy Precision Data.

M. Bastero-Gil

Scuola Internazionale Superiore di Studi Avanzati

34013 Trieste, ITALY.

Abstract

More precise unification predictions require going beyond the lowest order, including 2-loop running of the couplings and a correct treatment of threshold effects. Here we revised two different approaches to deal with light thresholds, based on different choices of the renormalization scheme, $\overline{MS}$ and effective couplings. We show the equivalence of both approaches in making predictions when thresholds are taken properly into account.

I. INTRODUCTION

Experimental data have always played a relevant role in building unification scenarios. Whereas Standard $SU(5)$ unification [1] was not completely ruled out by experiments in the early 80's, now attempts to unify without introducing new degrees of freedom between the electroweak scale and the unification scale does not work. Introduction of new degrees of freedom modifies β -functions, and opens up the possibility for unification. As a general result [2], one is constrained to introduce new physics at an intermediate scale $O(10^8 - 10^{12} \text{ GeV})$ [3], and/or to populate the spectrum with many new degrees of freedom at the scale of $O(1 \text{ TeV})$. The second alternative is provided by the Minimal Supersymmetric extension of the Standard Model (MSSM). Supersymmetric Grand Unification Theories (Susy GUT) [4] have been widely studied in the literature, in both versions, with [5] and without [6,7,8,9] intermediate scale.

Due to the presence of a rich susy spectrum at low energies (with masses no more than a few TeV), important light threshold contributions come into the game. The simplest procedure to deal with them consists of using the step-function approximation (or run-and-match procedure), so that a particle contributes to the evolution of the couplings only beyond its mass scale, giving zero contribution otherwise. However, the uncertainty principle tells us that the effects from a particle are felt not only beyond its excitation from the vacuum but, since the packet necessarily spreads in momentum, its contribution to the physical processes will occur even before its mass scale is reached, contrary to the assumption of the step-function approach. In order to get a more accurate description of the threshold behavior, one can compute the running couplings working with a Mass Dependent Subtraction Procedure (MDSP) [10,11], or the equivalent effective couplings [12,13,14], in which all the information about the mass spectrum is automatically included in the β -functions.

Another approach related to the correct treatment of light susy thresholds is that of Ref. [15]. They remark that the extraction of the values of the gauge coupling constants at the m_Z scale is not only renormalization scheme dependent but also *model dependent*. The values extracted assuming the Standard Model (SM) will not be equal to those extracted if we assume that the MSSM is correct, that is,

$$\alpha_i(m_Z) |_{MSSM} = \alpha_i(m_Z) |_{SM} + \delta\alpha_i(m_Z) |_{\text{new physics}} , \quad (1)$$

where “new physics” means new degrees of freedom different from those present in the SM. The question that arises again is to which accuracy do we want to compute the function $\delta\alpha_i(m_Z)$ [16], which includes those threshold effects due to the susy degrees of freedom. This function will also depend on the renormalization prescription used to define the gauge couplings. Working with $\overline{MS}$ but including *complete* threshold effects in $\delta\alpha_i$ we will get a non-zero contribution coming from new physics, even for masses several orders of magnitude above m_Z . With the use of the $\overline{MS}$ procedure, the decoupling theorem is not implemented. The situation is different for the effective couplings, and in this case those contributions coming from heavy degrees of freedom, relative to m_Z , are suppressed in $\delta\alpha_i$.

It is clear by now that in studying susy unification, as far as all thresholds are crossed in going from m_Z to M_X , different conclusions will be achieved when using an approximate treatment like the step-function [9], or the more accurate one [14,16]. Moreover, in studying *complete* threshold effects and the related modification of the evolution of the gauge couplings, we have different approaches, depending on the *renormalization scheme* we choose. For example,

- One can work with $\overline{MS}$, including the complete thresholds at the electroweak scale throughout Eq. (1). After that, we run the couplings up to the high energy region just using the $\overline{MS}$ β - functions, without the need of any other consideration about the mass spectrum.

- Other choice is to work instead with effective couplings (equivalent to work with a MDSP). The values of the effective couplings at the electroweak scale m_Z will be different from those of the $\overline{MS}$ couplings. At each scale $\mu \geq m_Z$, the contribution of a massive degree of freedom is controlled via a smooth function $F(m/\mu)$ which gives an appropriate threshold crossing as we evolve the couplings, and goes to zero for masses $m \gg \mu$.

As physical quantities and physical conclusions must be renormalization scheme independent, and in both approaches *complete* thresholds are supposed to be included, the conclusions reached about unification using one approach or another *should* be the same. In this work, we aim to show explicitly that in fact this is the case. In particular, we will compare the prediction for the QCD coupling $\alpha_3(m_Z)^{-1}$ in both schemes. We can not expect these values to be equal, because they refer to different renormalization prescriptions. However, we can calculate independently the relation between different schemes. Therefore, we will recover the prediction of the effective couplings approach from that of the $\overline{MS}$ couplings and vice versa.

This is the normal procedure to deal with physical processes and experimental quantities. Using perturbation theory, they are written like a series expansion in some parameter, say the coupling constant, in a given renormalization scheme. Depending on the expansion parameter, the coefficients in the series will be different, but the final result must be the

same (modulo higher order corrections).

In Section 2 we will extract the values of the MSSM gauge couplings at m_Z in both schemes, effective couplings¹ and $\overline{MS}$. Comparing with the values for the SM and $\overline{MS}$, we will see that the main source of the differences is not due to susy threshold effects, but lies on the renormalization prescription is used. The difference is more pronounced for the value of the QCD coupling constant.

In Section 3 we use these initial values to check the unification scenario, and the equivalence of the predictions in both approaches. When working with effective couplings, as we approach the high energy region, we would expect to feel the heavy degrees of freedom coming from the unification group. These fields are needed in order to get not only the same value, but the same evolution of the couplings beyond some scale M_X . Their contributions depend on the specific unification group considered. As far as we are not interested in the study of a particular model, we will try to keep the discussion as general as possible, but we will fix the unification group to be $SU(5)$ when needed for numerical calculations. The inclusion of these heavy threshold effects will also be relevant to get the same results with effective couplings and $\overline{MS}$.

In section 4 we present our concluding remarks.

II. INITIAL VALUES AT m_Z

The renormalized couplings using a MDSP are equivalent to effective couplings, defined by [14],

$$\alpha_i^{-1}(q^2) = \alpha_{i0}^{-1} + \left(\Pi_i^T(q) + 2\Gamma_i^U(q) \right)$$

¹Our work with effective couplings is based in that of Ref. [14]. In that work, we took as initial data for the effective couplings at m_Z those values quoted by the Particle Data Group [23], that is, those initial values valid for the SM when using $\overline{MS}$. Here we compute the correct initial values at m_Z for the effective couplings.

$$= \alpha_i^{-1}(q_0^2) + \left(\Pi_i^T(q^2) + 2\Gamma_i^U(q^2) - \Pi_i^T(q_0^2) - 2\Gamma_i^U(q_0^2) \right), \quad (2)$$

where α_{i0} is the bare coupling constant, Π_i^T is the transverse component of the bare vacuum polarization tensor of the gauge boson defining the interaction, and Γ_i^U is the universal (process-independent) vertex correction. All the dependence on the masses is included in these functions. The divergences of the bare function Π_i^T , and Γ_i^U , cancel out in the differences, and we do not need any additional assumption to render finite the above expression.

The initial values² $\alpha_e(m_Z)^{-1}$ and $\alpha_2(m_Z)^{-1}$ can be obtained from the set of experimental data $G_\mu = 1.16639 \times 10^{-5} \text{ GeV}^2$, $\alpha_e(0) = 1/137.036$ and $m_Z = 91.19 \text{ GeV}$. The value $\alpha_e(m_Z)^{-1}$ is obtained using $\alpha_e(0)$ and Eq. (2) for $q_0^2 = 0$. That expression can be written in a more familiar way like,

$$\alpha_e^{-1}(m_Z) = \alpha_e^{-1}(0) [1 + \Delta\alpha_e(m_Z)], \quad (3)$$

where,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta\alpha_e(m_Z) &= \alpha_e(0) \left[\Pi_\gamma^T(m_Z) + 2\Gamma_\gamma^U(m_Z) - \Pi_\gamma^T(0) - 2\Gamma_\gamma^U(0) \right] \\ &= \Delta\alpha_{leptons}(m_Z) + \Delta\alpha_{hadrons}^{(5)}(m_Z) + \Delta\alpha_{top}(m_Z) + \Delta\alpha_{gauge}(m_Z) + \Delta\alpha_{susy}(m_Z). \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

All the terms in Eq. (4) except that for the light quarks $\Delta\alpha_{hadrons}^{(5)}$, can be computed in perturbation theory. For the latter, we use the recent data [17],

$$\Delta\alpha_{hadrons}^{(5)}(m_Z) = 0.0280 \pm 0.0007. \quad (5)$$

We also include the dominant fermionic 2-loops contributions of $O(\alpha_e^2)$ and $O(\alpha_e\alpha_3)$ in the other terms. [18].

In order to obtain $\alpha_2(m_Z)^{-1}$, we use the definition of G_μ as the limit of the charged current process involved in μ decay when $q^2 \rightarrow 0$ [19]. Following the general argument sketched in Appendix A, we get the relation:

² α_1^{-1} is given by the relation $\alpha_1^{-1} = 3(\alpha_e^{-1} - \alpha_2^{-1})/5$, at any scale.

$$\alpha_2(q)^{-1} = \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{2}G_\mu m_W^2} + \Pi_W^L(0) - \Pi_W^L(m_W) + \Pi_W^T(q) - \Pi_W^T(m_W) + 2\Gamma_W^U(q) - \delta_W(0). \quad (6)$$

All the functions [20] Π_W^L , Π_W^T , Γ_W^U and δ_W (complete vertex and box contribution to the μ -decay) are *bare* functions. The divergences cancel out in the differences, the same than in Eq. (2).

Setting $q^2 = 0$ in Eq. 6 we get the value of $\alpha_2(0)$. Notice that $\alpha_2(0)$ can be expressed as,

$$\frac{G_\mu}{\sqrt{2}} = \frac{\pi\alpha_2(0)}{2m_W^2(0)}(1 - \delta_W^{PD}(0)). \quad (7)$$

Apart from the “process-dependent” term (which can be included in a redefinition of the G_μ as a universal Fermi constant), we see that the value $\alpha_2(0)$ can be related more directly to an experimental quantity [21], in an analogous way to the extraction of $\alpha_e(0)$ from Compton scattering. Therefore we have a close expression for both $\alpha_e(m_Z)^{-1}$ and $\alpha_2(m_Z)^{-1}$ in terms of the respective values at zero momentum:

$$\alpha_i^{-1}(m_Z) = \alpha_i^{-1}(0) [1 + \Delta\alpha_i(m_Z)] , \quad (8)$$

If we want to compute instead the $\overline{MS}$ -couplings, we get (see Eq.(A10)):

$$\hat{\alpha}_i^{-1}(m_Z) = \alpha_i^{-1}(0) - (\hat{\Pi}_i^T(0) + 2\hat{\Gamma}_i^U(0)) \quad (9)$$

$$= \alpha_i^{-1}(0) [1 + \Delta\hat{\alpha}_i(0)] . \quad (10)$$

Complete susy thresholds effects are included through their contribution to the functions $\hat{\Pi}_i$ and $\hat{\Gamma}_i$, where the divergent term has been subtracted, and the renormalization scale has set to m_Z .

The explicit values of $\alpha_e(m_Z)^{-1}$ and $\alpha_2(m_Z)^{-1}$ depend on the susy spectrum considered, but as a general result they are typically larger than the corresponding values of $\hat{\alpha}_i(m_Z)^{-1} |_{SM}$. On the following, we will use the notation $\hat{\alpha}_i$ to denote $\overline{MS}$ couplings, and the subscript SM when we do not include susy degrees of freedom, only the standard ones. We will use the simplest parameterization of the susy spectrum, assuming universal soft susy breaking terms at the GUT scale, and neglecting the mixing between charginos

and higgsinos, and stops left and right. With these simplifications, we need only six mass parameters for the matter spectrum: $m_{1/2}$ for the gaugino masses ($m_i \approx c_i m_{1/2}$, $c_{\tilde{g}} = 3$, $c_{\tilde{w}} = 1$); $m_{1/2}$ and m_0 (common scalar mass at the GUT scale) for sleptons and squarks ($m_i = \sqrt{c_i m_{1/2}^2 + m_0^2}$, $c_{\tilde{l}} = 0.5$, $c_{\tilde{\tau}} = 0.15$, $c_{\tilde{q}} = 7$); a common mass parameter, $m_{\tilde{h}}$, for the higgsinos; a common mass, m_H , for the heaviest Higgses, and m_h for the Standard lightest Higgs; and also m_t for the top mass. We will take the susy mass parameters to be not larger than 1 TeV (naturalness bound). From the experimental searches, we have the lower bounds: $m_{1/2} \geq 65 \text{ GeV}$ and $m_h \geq 60 \text{ GeV}$. The susy parameters $m_{\tilde{h}}$ and m_H will be taken at least of $O(m_Z)$. For the top mass, we have the data: $m_t = 176 \pm 8 \pm 10$ (CDF) and $m_t = 199 \pm 20_{-21}^{+19}$ (D0) [22]. For numerical calculations we will allow $m_t = 200 \text{ GeV}$.

With these constraints, and also assuming $m_0 = m_{1/2}$ and $m_{\tilde{h}} = m_H$, we can write the numerical values of the effective couplings at m_Z like:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_e(m_Z)^{-1} = & 129.08 + 1.0 \times 10^{-2} \Delta_t(176 \text{ GeV}) \\ & + 3.9 \times 10^{-4} \Delta_{1/2}(1 \text{ TeV}) + 1.8 \times 10^{-4} \Delta_H(1 \text{ TeV}) \pm 0.3, \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_2(m_Z)^{-1} = & 30.087 + 1.5 \times 10^{-2} \Delta_t(176 \text{ GeV}) + 2.3 \times 10^{-2} \Delta_h(60 \text{ GeV}) \\ & + 2.4 \times 10^{-4} \Delta_{1/2}(1 \text{ TeV}) + 1.7 \times 10^{-4} \Delta_H(1 \text{ TeV}) \pm 0.09, \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

with,

$$\Delta_i(m_0) = 1 - \left(\frac{m_0}{m_i} \right)^2. \quad (13)$$

For arbitrary susy masses, these values are typically 1% larger than those of $\hat{\alpha}_i^{-1}(m_Z) |_{SM}$ [23]:

$$\hat{\alpha}_e^{-1} = 127.9 \pm 0.3, \quad \hat{\alpha}_2^{-1} = 29.66 \pm 0.09. \quad (14)$$

Due to the decoupling of the massive degrees of freedom in the effective couplings, the values quoted above for susy masses $O(1 \text{ TeV})$ are practically the same as those we would get for the SM effective couplings. Therefore, the initial “increasing” of the effective couplings with respect to the $\overline{MS}$ -couplings at m_Z is not due to the susy contributions, or in general

to any massive contribution, but due to those coming from light quarks and leptons, which can be considered as massless at the m_Z scale. For example, the contribution of a “light” fermion (m_f much less than m_Z) to the effective coupling would be:

$$\Delta\alpha_i^{(f)}(m_Z) = \alpha_i(0) \frac{2}{3\pi} T_i^f \left(\frac{5}{6} + \log \frac{m_f}{m_Z} \right), \quad (15)$$

whereas the $\overline{MS}$ contribution is:

$$\Delta\hat{\alpha}_i(0)^{(f)} = \alpha_i(0) \frac{2}{3\pi} T_i^f \log \frac{m_f}{m_Z}. \quad (16)$$

In computing both $\alpha_i(m_Z)^{-1}$ and $\hat{\alpha}_i(m_Z)^{-1}$, we run the couplings from zero momentum to m_Z , so that all the light thresholds are crossed. But for $\hat{\alpha}_i(m_Z)^{-1}$ one uses no more than the step-function approximation, while for the effective couplings we use a smother function [10,11]. That is the origin of the constant factor in Eq. (15), and when we sum over all the “light” fermions, the main reason of the difference between $\alpha_i(m_Z)^{-1}$ and $\hat{\alpha}_i(m_Z)^{-1}$ [24].

The value of the QCD coupling will be derived imposing unification within MSSM. However, the value extracted from the experiment is the $\overline{MS}$ couplings valid for the SM. In order to compare, we have to eliminate the contribution due to the susy degrees of freedom [16], and to change from “effective” to “ $\overline{MS}$ ” when required, that is,

$$\hat{\alpha}_3(m_Z)^{-1} |_{SM} = \hat{\alpha}_3^{-1}(m_Z) + \left(\hat{\Pi}_g^T(m_Z) + \hat{\delta}_3(m_Z) \right) |_{susy} + \frac{1}{4\pi} \quad (17)$$

$$= \alpha_3(m_Z)^{-1} - \left(\hat{\Pi}_g^T(m_Z) + 2\hat{\Gamma}_3^U(m_Z) \right) |_{MSSM} + \left(\hat{\Pi}_g^T(m_Z) + \hat{\delta}_3(m_Z) \right) |_{susy} + \frac{1}{4\pi}, \quad (18)$$

where the factor “ $1/4\pi$ ” is due to the change in the regularization procedure (from dimensional reduction to dimensional regularization) when working with the SM. In the next section we will show that in fact Eqs. (17) and (18) yield the same result.

Like for the other two couplings, the main difference between the effective coupling $\alpha_3(m_Z)^{-1}$ and $\hat{\alpha}_3(m_Z)^{-1} |_{SM}$ is due to the change in the renormalization scheme, that is, to the contribution of the massless degrees of freedom. We have not only the light quarks, but also the gluon contribution [14],

$$\left(\hat{\Pi}_g^T(m_Z) + 2\hat{\Gamma}_3^U(m_Z) \right) |_{gluon} = -\frac{C_2(SU(3))}{4\pi} \left(-\frac{11}{3} \ln \frac{m_Z^2}{\mu^2} + \frac{157}{36} \right). \quad (19)$$

Both together make the value of the effective QCD coupling roughly an 8% larger than $\hat{\alpha}_3(m_Z) |_{SM} = 0.117 \pm 0.005$ [23].

The value of $\hat{\alpha}_3(m_Z) |_{SM}$ quoted above is the average of a set of values coming from different experiments. Contrary to the situation with α_e or α_2 , in QCD we do not have a natural experimental process to extract the value of α_3 . The difference is obvious, because there is no limit to zero-momentum transferred in QCD. We have a collection of physical observables, which can be used to define “effective couplings” taking into account the entire radiative correction into its definition, one for each process, and can be related among them [13]; for example,

$$R(Q) \equiv \frac{11}{3} \left(1 + \frac{\alpha_R(Q)}{\pi} \right), \quad (20)$$

being $R(Q)$ the total hadronic cross section in e^+e^- annihilation. On the other hand, one can select a particular renormalization scheme, say $\overline{MS}$ -coupling, and express each observable like a series expansion in this parameter, like [25],

$$R(Q) = \frac{11}{3} \left(1 + \frac{\hat{\alpha}_3}{\pi} + 1.4092 \left(\frac{\hat{\alpha}_3}{\pi} \right)^2 + \dots \right). \quad (21)$$

Infinite series will return exactly the renormalization-scheme invariant experimental quantities. But in practice, we have available only finite order series, which can lead to different theoretical predictions depending on the expansion parameter chosen. In that sense, not all the couplings will be reliable for all the processes. Moreover, the effective couplings like α_R are process-dependent by definition. The choice of the best expansion parameter, and how to set its scale [26], is a major point of discussion in making theoretical predictions for QCD. The values obtained using different convention may be quite different. Using the renormalization group equations (RGE) to get $\alpha_R(m_Z)$ from $\alpha_R(31.6 \text{ GeV}) = 0.165 \pm 0.016$ [27], one gets a value of $O(10\%)$ larger than $\hat{\alpha}_3(m_Z)$.

Another example is provided by the “momentum-scale” subtraction QCD coupling [28], which is related to the $\overline{MS}$ coupling by,

$$\alpha_3^{mom} = \hat{\alpha}_3 \left(1 + A(n_f) \frac{\hat{\alpha}_3}{\pi} + \dots \right), \quad A(5) = 1.9776. \quad (22)$$

Again, we would obtain α_3^{mom} of roughly a 7% larger than $\hat{\alpha}_3$. The definition of α_3^{mom} is gauge and process dependent, that is, depends on the vertex chosen to set the renormalization constant (trigluon vertex, quark–gluon,...). In Eq. (22) α_3^{mom} is given in the Landau gauge and for the trigluon vertex. Other possible choices do not change appreciable the numerical factor $A(5)$.

The problem of gauge dependence of the effective charges [29], in the sense of explicit presence of the gauge parameter in the constant contribution, also afflicts the definition we use. In order to minimize their effect in the evolution with the scale, we work in the Landau gauge, which is a fixed point of the RGE for the gauge parameter. This problem can be solved including the appropriate box corrections. However, these are process–dependent corrections, as those coming from the vertex. In order to have some kind of universal QCD coupling we would need to set some convention to define the process independent contribution.

In this line it works the effective QCD coupling defined by the interaction potential between two infinitely massive quarks [30], in the same spirit than the pure QED effective coupling,

$$V(Q) \equiv -\frac{4\pi C_F \alpha_v(Q)}{Q^2}. \quad (23)$$

Threshold effects are associated with the radiative corrections to the propagator of the exchanged gluon, rather than the vertex or box corrections. Therefore, they are universal, and vertex and boxes are only intended to ensure the gauge independence of α_v . In principle, α_v (and its extension to the supersymmetric theory) would provide a good scheme to deal with thresholds. However, in order to study unification (our main motivation), we should extend this scheme, or any other, to define α_e and α_2 , with the additional complication that these couplings are related to a broken gauge symmetry above m_Z . Because of that, we have at first set the renormalization scheme for the effective α_e and α_2 , and extended it to α_3 afterwards. For the broken theory, we use the fact that the “universal vertex correction” is related to the longitudinal term of the mixed vacuum polarization tensor for the neutral

bosons [31].

If we correctly set the relation between different schemes, it does not matter which renormalization scheme we consider, as far as we know what are the physical effects included, say threshold effects. This is the last step in order to compare the theoretical predictions with the available experimental data.

III. UNIFICATION WITH HEAVY THRESHOLDS

A real unification picture of the gauge couplings implies not only to get a common value at some point in the high energy sector, but a common evolution beyond some scale up to the Planck scale, which can be identified with the value and evolution of the gauge coupling associated with the unification group. This can be obtained only through the modification of the running of the couplings due to new (heavy) degrees of freedom coming from the unification group [32]. We will fix, when needed, the unification group to be $SU(5)$. The same problem of accuracy of crossing the heavy thresholds will appear again in the high energy region.

The heavy mass spectrum of $SU(5)$ is given as usual in terms of 3 mass parameters: M_V , for the heavy gauge boson masses, M_Φ for the color triplet Higgs, and M_Σ for the scalars in the adjoint. After including the contribution of these new particles in the running of the effective couplings, we will get real unification above some scale *larger than the largest heavy mass parameter*. Therefore, we will fix the unification condition for the gauge couplings at the Planck scale, M_P , that is,

$$\alpha_1^{-1}(M_P) = \alpha_2^{-1}(M_P) = \alpha_3^{-1}(M_P). \quad (24)$$

The expressions for the effective gauge couplings, including also the heavy degrees of freedom coming from $SU(5)$ are given in Appendix B, at 1-loop and 2-loops order. Thresholds at 2-loop order are treated in an approximate way. In fact, we neglect those of the light massive degrees of freedom in the 2-loop coefficients. The inclusion of more detailed

2-loop threshold functions would introduce only a modification less than 1% in the running of the couplings. However, we can not forget about the contribution of the heaviest masses at 2-loops, as we need to get at the end of the energy scale the same evolution for the three couplings. As we know that these degrees of freedom are completely decoupled well below their mass scale, we use for these masses the step-function approximation in the 2-loop coefficients.

If we work instead with the couplings $\hat{\alpha}_i^{-1}$, susy thresholds are included in the initial values at m_Z , but there is no indication about how to cross the heavy ones. A consistent approach would be to integrate out these heavy degrees of freedom from the complete action $S[G]$ [33], and in this way one gets the unification condition:

$$\hat{\alpha}_i(\mu)^{-1} = \hat{\alpha}_G^{-1} + \lambda_i(\mu), \quad (25)$$

where μ is a scale much larger than all light masses, and much smaller than the heavy masses³. The function $\lambda_i(\mu)$ is given at 1-loop order by:

$$\lambda_i(\mu) = -\frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{j=Heavy} b_i^{(j)} \ln \frac{M_j}{\mu}. \quad (26)$$

It is straightforward to show now that both equations (24) and (25) are completely equivalent, and thus we will obtain the same predictions for $\hat{\alpha}_3(m_Z)^{-1}$, that is, for $\hat{\alpha}_3(m_Z)^{-1} |_{SM}$, with both approaches.

First, we compute the value of $\alpha_i^{-1}(\mu)$ from $\alpha_i^{-1}(M_P) = \alpha_G^{-1}(M_P)$, that is,

$$\alpha_i^{-1}(\mu) = \alpha_G^{-1}(M_P) + F_i(\mu) - F_i(M_P), \quad (27)$$

where in order to simplify the notation, we have defined:

$$F_i(q) = \Pi_i^T(q) + 2\Pi_i^U(q). \quad (28)$$

Using the relation between effective couplings and $\overline{MS}$ couplings, we get:

³“much larger, much smaller” means at least two orders of magnitude of difference.

$$\alpha_i^{-1}(\mu) - \hat{F}_i^{(l)}(\mu) = \alpha_G^{-1}(M_P) - \hat{F}_i(M_P) + \hat{F}_i^{(H)}(\mu), \quad (29)$$

$$\hat{\alpha}_i^{-1}(\mu) = \hat{\alpha}_G^{-1}(\mu) + \hat{F}_i^{(H)}(\mu), \quad (30)$$

where $\hat{F}_i$ means that the divergence $2/\epsilon$ has been subtracted, and now the renormalization scale has been set to μ ; the subscript “H” indicates only heavy degrees of freedom, while “l” refers to the light particles. The function $\hat{F}_i^{(H)}(\mu)$ is that we obtain when the heavy degrees of freedom are integrated out, i.e., that we call above $\lambda_i(\mu)$.

In this derivation, no reference is made to the order of perturbation theory we were working, and therefore the equivalence between both approaches is maintained at *any* order of perturbation theory. However, an additional result obtained, working with $\overline{MS}$ couplings, is that the function $\lambda_i(\mu)$, which includes the information about the heavy spectrum, *should be computed at the same order of perturbation theory than the couplings* $\hat{\alpha}_i^{-1}$.

It is commonly assumed that if we run the couplings at 2-loop order we need only $\lambda_i(\mu)$ at 1-loop, i.e., 2-loops heavy thresholds correction would be a higher order correction, and thus, negligible. That argument relies on the fact that these correction are $O(\hat{\alpha}_G)$, and therefore in principle negligible in the R.H.S. of Eq. (25),

$$\hat{\alpha}_i^{-1}(\mu) = \hat{\alpha}_G^{-1}(\mu) - \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{j=Heavy} b_i^{(j)} \ln \frac{M_j}{\mu} + O(\hat{\alpha}_G). \quad (31)$$

Nevertheless, when $\hat{\alpha}_i^{-1}(\mu)$ is computed at 2-loop order these are the kind of corrections, $O(\hat{\alpha}_j(\mu))$, which are taken into account in the L.H.S. From this point of view, there is no any reason to neglect them in the R.H.S.

That argument would also imply that working at 1-loop order it is not needed any heavy threshold correction in the unification condition, that is,

$$\hat{\alpha}_i^{-1}(M_X) = \hat{\alpha}_G^{-1}(M_X), \quad (32)$$

where M_X would be some point in the high energy region. But that is no more than the unification condition when we consider a complete degenerate heavy spectrum, being M_X the heavy mass scale. Heavy threshold corrections depend on the degree of degeneracy of

the spectrum, independently of the order of perturbation theory we work with. Eq. (32) can not be considered as the unification condition for a more general heavy spectrum, even at 1-loop. Moreover, that would not be compatible with the picture obtained with the effective couplings. And if unification is a physical process, it should be independent of the renormalization scheme we use to study it.

In a more general case, notice that when we include only 1-loop heavy thresholds corrections in the running of 2-loop $\overline{MS}$ couplings, we end up with a dependence on the scale “ μ ” to which the unification condition is imposed. On one hand, when we integrate out the heavy fields from the action, that scale has to be much smaller than the heavy masses if we want to keep only the dominant logarithmic contributions in $\lambda_i(\mu)$. On the other hand, one can prefer $\mu \approx M_j$ in order to avoid large corrections to the relation between the couplings. But all this arbitrariness in μ disappears when we work with $\lambda(\mu)$ at the same order as that the couplings, and we do not have to worry about any specific choice. The RGE guarantees that Eq. (25) is *scale invariant*, when all the terms involved are computed at the same order in perturbation theory. Taking the derivate respect to $\ln \mu$ we get,

$$\frac{d\lambda_i(\mu)^{(1-loop)}}{d \ln \mu} = \frac{1}{2\pi}(b_G^{(1)} - b_i) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{k=heavy} b_i^{(k)} \theta(M_k - \mu), \quad (33)$$

$$\frac{d\lambda_i(\mu)^{(2-loop)}}{d \ln \mu} = \frac{1}{8\pi^2}(b_G^{(2)} \hat{\alpha}_G(\mu) - \sum_j b_{ij} \hat{\alpha}_j(\mu)) \approx \frac{1}{8\pi^2} \sum_{k=Heavy} \sum_j b_{ij}^{(k)} \hat{\alpha}_G(\mu) \theta(M_k - \mu), \quad (34)$$

where $b_G^{(1)}$, $b_G^{(2)}$ are the 1-loop and 2-loops coefficients for the unification group G . The uncertainty introduced when neglecting $\lambda_i(\mu)^{(2-loop)}$ will depend on the nature of the unification group, and mainly on the degree of degeneracy of the heavy spectrum. For a nearly degenerate spectrum, the choice $\mu \approx M_k$ will minimize the contribution of $\lambda^{(2-loop)}$ (and also $\lambda^{(1-loop)}$). In the case of $SU(5)$, with only 3 relevant heavy mass parameters, even if we allow a different of 2 to 3 orders of magnitude among them the correction $\lambda_i^{(2-loop)}$ would not change the prediction of $\hat{\alpha}_3$ by more than $O(1\%)$. However, this may be not the case once the heavy spectrum is enlarged. For example, in the Missing Doublet $SU(5)$ Model [34] the scalar that breaks the symmetry down to the MSSM is contained in the 75 representation

of $SU(5)$, instead of using the 24-Higgs. However, the 75 fields are not degenerate in mass, and the ratios of their masses will contribute to the prediction of $\hat{\alpha}_3^{-1}$ [35,36]. These constant factors can enhance the 1-loop prediction by a factor of $O(12\%)$. Due to the presence of large $b_{ij}^{(k)}$ coefficients, this sector will also make an important contribution to order 2-loops, even an increasing of $O(10\%)$.

To avoid such uncertainties at the 2-loop level, we adopt the same kind of approach to treat 2-loop heavy mass corrections than with the effective couplings. That is, we include their contribution in the b_{ij} coefficients using the step-function approximation, and demanding unification at a scale larger than the heaviest mass, say the Planck scale.

The value of M_V and the unification gauge coupling are derived together with $\alpha_3(m_Z)$ from the unification condition. The value of M_Φ is bounded by the limits on proton decay via dimension-five operators [8]. The minimum allowed value of M_Φ will depend on the masses of gauginos, squarks and sleptons, decreasing with the ratio $\xi_0 = (m_0/m_{1/2})^2$. On the other hand, the value of $\alpha_3(m_Z)$ decreases when the susy masses are raised, and increases with M_Φ . The minimum value for the QCD coupling is obtained for squark and higgsino masses of 1 TeV (naturalness bound) and $m_{1/2} \simeq 70\text{ GeV}$. In Table I we have given the minimum value of $\alpha_3(m_Z)|_{SM}$ obtained with both the effective couplings and $\overline{MS}$, for different values of M_Σ . At the 2-loop order we have a mild dependence on this variable in the value of $\alpha_3(m_Z)$. Nevertheless, M_Σ affects mainly the prediction of M_V . We can get a large value of M_V (and therefore of the unification scale) just diminishing enough that of M_Σ .

We can see from Table I that Susy $SU(5)$ unification requires $\alpha_3(m_Z) \geq 0.127$ with a susy spectrum not larger than 1 TeV [16]. Notice that the value of M_X quoted for a degenerate heavy spectrum would not be compatible with the constraints on proton decay. To get a larger M_X we have to reduce the gaugino mass, and therefore we would increase the value of $\alpha_3(m_Z)$. Nevertheless, we do not aim to remark these numerical values as in our study several effects suitable of changing them were not included. In the first place, we have not taken into account the Yukawa contribution to the 2-loop running of the Yukawa couplings, just for the sake of simplicity. This correction is not expected to lower $\alpha_3(m_Z)$ more than

an 1%.

The second correction not included is that due to non renormalizable operators coming from quantum gravitational effects [37], which begin to be relevant as we approach the Planck scale. Although these operators are suppressed by a factor M_X/M_P their unknown strength may introduce a large correction which can have either sign. At present, this unknown factor would enlarge the allowed range for $\alpha_3(m_Z)$ to be compatible with any experimental value. On the other hand, a more precise measurement of the QCD coupling together with the observation of proton decay (which would give the value of M_V or M_Φ) can constrain the strength of the gravitational effects [38].

IV. CONCLUDING REMARKS

The precision reached in the experimental extraction of α_e and α_2 has promoted during the last years the study of supersymmetric unification beyond the lowest order approximation. This leads to the inclusion of 2-loop effects in the running of the gauge couplings, together with a proper treatment of light and heavy threshold effects. Here we have focussed on the treatment of light thresholds beyond the leading log approximation, and the related topic of renormalization scheme dependence.

Physical processes are renormalization scheme independent, but it is not so for the gauge coupling parameters. The latter are extracted from the physical quantities using the $\overline{MS}$ scheme and assuming the SM. To study unification in the MSSM we can choose different schemes to set the running of the couplings. Using $\overline{MS}$ scheme complete light thresholds are included in the initial value of the couplings at m_Z , but not in their evolution. Using effective couplings, the values at m_Z are also modified by the presence of massive degrees of freedom, but contributions from large masses are decoupled at m_Z . When running the couplings, the Mass Dependent RGE gives us the correct crossing of the thresholds. We have explicitly shown that both schemes gives the same prediction for the QCD gauge coupling, once the conversion to the $\overline{MS}$ scheme and the SM is done (see Table I). These values are obtained

at 2-loop order including also heavy threshold contributions, which are important when the heavy spectrum is non degenerate (as can be expected in realistic models). Renormalization group arguments show that heavy thresholds have to be included at the same order of perturbation theory we run the couplings. In minimal $SU(5)$ one does not expect 2-loop heavy thresholds to be large; however, this might not be the case for other unification models with more heavy degrees of freedom.

Working in MSSM with $\overline{MS}$ has the obvious advantage that this is the renormalization scheme used to give the experimental data in the SM. The conversion only requires the suppression of the new degrees of freedom from the values of the gauge couplings. It has the disadvantage that there is no information in this scheme about how to treat new thresholds. The initial values $\hat{\alpha}_i(m_Z)$ for the MSSM will not be valid if we allow for example the presence of extra matter [39] at a scale larger than m_Z (but below the unification scale). The values of $\hat{\alpha}_i(m_Z)$ including thresholds would not be a good indication of the strength of the interaction at that scale, unless we impose decoupling. For each model, we have to readjust both the β -functions and the initial conditions. The situation is different for the effective couplings. The matter content at the scale m_Z (masses near this scale) fixes the values of the couplings. The introduction of heavier degrees of freedom is done through their β -functions when the couplings evolve with the scale, which takes into account a smooth threshold crossing.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank B. Brahmachari, J. C. Pati, K. S. Babu, S. Brodsky and J. Pérez-Mercader for very enlightening discussions.

TABLES

TABLE I. Minimum value of $\alpha_3(m_Z) |_{SM}$ obtained with both the effective couplings and $\overline{MS}$, for different values of M_Σ and $M_\Phi = 10^{16.73}$. The latter is the lower value consistent with proton decay when the susy masses are $m_{\tilde{q}} = m_{\tilde{h}} = 1 TeV$, $m_{1/2} = 71 GeV$ ($\xi_0 \simeq 190$). We also quote the value of $\alpha_3(m_Z)$ for the MSSM. In the case of degenerate heavy spectrum, $m_{1/2} = 377 GeV$ ($\xi_0 = 0.1$) .

	$\overline{MS}$ couplings		Effective couplings		
M_Σ	$\hat{\alpha}_3^{-1} _{SM}$	M_V	$\alpha_3(m_Z) _{SM}$	M_V	$\alpha_3(m_Z) _{MSSM}$
Degenerate	0.1220	$10^{16.10}$	0.1232	$10^{16.14}$	0.1345
Heavy spectrum					
10^{14}	0.1264	$10^{17.70}$	0.1269	$10^{17.76}$	0.1391
10^{15}	0.1268	$10^{17.15}$	0.1273	$10^{17.21}$	0.1397
10^{16}	0.1272	$10^{16.61}$	0.1277	$10^{16.66}$	0.1401

APPENDIX A

In this Appendix we give the general expression for the relation between experimental quantities and effective couplings. We want to keep the discussion as general as possible, so we do not make use of any particular experimental value. Let us assume instead that we have available the experimental value for the transition amplitude, A_{exp} , obtained from the scattering process at the scale q_0 , mediated by the gauge boson associated with the coupling α_i . Once the radiative corrections are taken into account, we can write down the expression for $A_{exp}(q_0)$ like:

$$A_{exp}(q_0) = \frac{\alpha_{i0}}{q_0^2 - m_{i0}^2} \left\{ 1 - \alpha_{i0} \frac{\Pi_i(q_0)}{q_0^2 - m_{i0}^2} - \alpha_{i0} 2\Gamma_i(q_0) - (q_0^2 - m_{i0}^2) \alpha_{i0} B_i(q_0) \right\}, \quad (A1)$$

where m_{i0} and α_{i0} are the bare mass and coupling, and Π_i , Γ_i and B_i are the bare vacuum polarization, vertex and box contributions respectively (defined without the factor α_{i0} , that has been written explicitly). For the gauge vacuum polarization tensor, we follow the convention:

$$\Pi_i^{\mu\nu}(q) = (g^{\mu\nu} q^2 - q^\mu q^\nu) \Pi_i^T(q) + m_{i0}^2 g^{\mu\nu} \Pi_i^L(q) \quad (A2)$$

where “T” and “L” have the usual meaning of transverse and longitudinal terms.

The L.H.S. of Eq. (A1) is both gauge invariant and finite. The bare mass can be replaced in terms of the physical mass, m_i , through the equation:

$$m_i^2 = m_{i0}^2 - \alpha_{i0} \Pi_i(m_i). \quad (A3)$$

And we obtain:

$$\frac{A_{exp}^{-1}(q_0)}{q_0^2 - m_i^2} = \alpha_{i0}^{-1} + \frac{\Pi_i(q_0) - \Pi(m_i)}{q_0^2 - m_i^2} + 2\Gamma_i(q_0) + (q_0^2 - m_i^2) B_i(q_0). \quad (A4)$$

The remaining divergences of the L.H.S. of Eq.(A4) will cancel out when we replace the bare coupling by the renormalized coupling, whatever the renormalization scheme we use. Instead of working this way, let us use Eq. (A4) like a definition for the bare coupling.

Therefore, this can be used to get, for example, the renormalized $\overline{MS}$ -coupling, replacing back α_{i0} in the definition

$$\hat{\alpha}_i^{-1}(\mu) = Z_i \alpha_{i0}^{-1}, \quad (\text{A5})$$

where Z_i is the corresponding product of renormalization constants, and μ is the renormalization scale. Or we can get the effective coupling, $\alpha_i(q)$, in a similar way:

$$\alpha_i^{-1}(q) = \alpha_{i0}^{-1} + \left(\Pi_i^T(q) + 2\Gamma_i^U(q) \right) \quad (\text{A6})$$

$$= \frac{A_{exp}^{-1}(q_0)}{q_0^2 - m_i^2} - \frac{\Pi_i(q_0) - \Pi(m_i)}{q_0^2 - m_i^2} + \Pi_i^T(q) - \delta_i(q_0) + 2\Gamma_i^U(q). \quad (\text{A7})$$

In the last line we have arranged the vertex and box contributions in the function δ_i . Notice that the function Γ_i^U is not the complete vertex that appeared in Eq. (A1), but the process-independent (universal) part of this function.

A final remark about the functions Π_i^T and Γ_i^U . Those functions involved in the definition of the effective couplings (Eq. (A6)), are defined in Euclidean space-time, so that in some sense we are working with “Euclidean” effective couplings. We make this choice instead of keeping the momentum in Minkowski space-time because we were interested in dealing with continuous differentiable functions when crossing the thresholds. On the other hand, the functions involved in Eqs. (A1) and (A4) are defined using Minkowski momentum, and that produces both kind of behaviors to be mixed in the relation (A7). This is perfectly consistent. However, if we had defined “Minkowski” effective couplings, we would have a more direct relation between those and physical quantities. For example, setting $q_0 = q$ and $m_i = 0$ (this would be the case for the QCD coupling) in Eq. (A7), we would get:

$$\alpha_i^{-1}(q) = \frac{A_{exp}^{-1}(q)}{q^2} - \delta_i^{PD}(q), \quad (\text{A8})$$

the last term being the process dependent contribution of vertex and boxes to the physical amplitude. Neglecting this term, we would have a direct measure of the effective coupling. With the Euclidean coupling we get instead,

$$\alpha_i^{-1}(q) |_{Mink} = \frac{A_{exp}^{-1}(q)}{q^2} - \delta_i^{PD}(q) - (\Pi_i^T(q) |_{Mink} - \Pi_i^T(q) |_{Eucl}). \quad (\text{A9})$$

The last difference is not negligible near the threshold of the massive particles . A “quasi” direct measurement of the Euclidean coupling is obtained only for scales q that are far enough of any threshold (below or beyond). Nevertheless, even if the Euclidean effective couplings are not so nicely related to the physical quantities as the Minkowski couplings, they both share the same kind of behavior with respect to the very light degrees of freedom, and most important, with respect to the very heavy degrees of freedom (decoupling).

In order to keep a simple notation we have not distinguish throughout the paper when is used the Euclidean momentum or the Minkowski momentum. However, these can be easily identified from the precedent discussion.

To end this appendix, we write also the relation between $\hat{\alpha}_i^{-1}$ and α_i^{-1} , given by:

$$\alpha_i^{-1}(q) = \hat{\alpha}_i^{-1}(\mu) + \left(\hat{\Pi}_i^T(q) + 2\hat{\Gamma}_i^U(q) \right), \quad (\text{A10})$$

that can be traced easily for example from the definition of effective coupling Eq. (A6) and that of the $\overline{MS}$ couplings Eq. (A5). The symbol “ $\hat{}$ ” over the functions Π_i and Γ_i means that the divergent term has been subtracted, and μ is the renormalization scale. The functions $\hat{\Pi}_i^T$ and $\hat{\Gamma}_i^U$ behave as $\ln M_i/\mu$ when $M_i/q \rightarrow 0$, and therefore decoupling is not present in the $\overline{MS}$ couplings.

APPENDIX B

Here we give the expression for the effective couplings including the heavy degrees of freedom coming from $SU(5)$. Their general expressions are given in Appendix A of Ref. [14]. The 1-loop $SU(5)$ contributions are given by,

$$(4\pi) \left(\Pi_i^T(q) + 2\Gamma_i^U(q) \right)^{(heavy)} = -\overline{C}_i G^{gauge}(M_V) + \frac{\overline{C}_i}{2} G^{chiral}(M_V) + \sum_{a=\Phi, \Sigma} b_i^a G^{chiral}(M_a), \quad (\text{B1})$$

where,

$$\overline{C}_i = C_2(SU(5)) - C_2(G_i) = (5, 3, 2),$$

$$b_i^\Phi = (2/5, 0, 1),$$

$$b_i^\Phi = (0, 2, 3),$$

and,

$$G^{gauge}(M_V) = 7 \left(\frac{2}{\varepsilon} - \ln \frac{-q^2}{\mu^2} \right) + \frac{13}{3} F_G(M_V, M_V) + 3F_F(M_V) + F_{SG}(0, M_V) - \frac{1}{3} F_S(0, 0) \quad (B2)$$

$$G^{chiral}(M_a) = \left(\frac{2}{\varepsilon} - \ln \frac{-q^2}{\mu^2} \right) + \frac{1}{3} F_S(M_a, M_a) + \frac{2}{3} F_F(M_a, M_a) \quad (B3)$$

The functions $F_i(M_j, M_k)$ are defined in [14].

At 2-loop order we have,

$$\alpha_i^{-1}(\mu) = \alpha_i^{-1}(\mu) |_{1-loop} - \frac{1}{8\pi^2} \int_{m_Z}^{\mu} b_{ij}(\mu') \alpha_j(\mu') d \ln \mu'. \quad (B4)$$

In a Mass Dependent renormalization scheme, the coefficient $b_{ij}(\mu')$ depends on the ratio of the masses and the scale. We neglect the contribution of light thresholds and approximate those of the heavy degrees of freedom by a step-function, $\theta_k = \theta_k(\mu - M_k)$. The b_{ij} coefficients for the MSSM are given in Ref. [40], and the heavy contribution for the matter content of $SU(5)$ is given by,

$$b_{11} = \frac{232}{3} \theta_V + \frac{167}{25} \theta_V \theta_\Phi + \frac{2}{75} \theta_\Phi,$$

$$b_{12} = 15 \theta_V,$$

$$b_{13} = \frac{80}{3} \theta_v + \frac{32}{15} \theta_\Phi,$$

$$b_{21} = 5 \theta_V,$$

$$b_{22} = 24 \theta_V + 3 \theta_V \theta_\Phi + 36 \theta_V \theta_\Sigma + 24 \theta_\Sigma,$$

$$b_{23} = 16 \theta_V,$$

$$b_{31} = \frac{10}{3} \theta_V + \frac{1}{15} \theta_\Phi,$$

$$b_{32} = 6 \theta_V,$$

$$b_{33} = \frac{50}{3} \theta_V + \frac{31}{5} \theta_V \theta_\Phi + 36 \theta_V \theta_\Sigma + \frac{34}{3} \theta_\Phi + 54 \theta_\Sigma.$$

REFERENCES

- [1] J. C. Pati and A. Salam, Phys. Rev. Lett. **31** (1973) 661; Phys. Rev. **D 8** (1973) 1240; H. Georgi and S. L. Glashow, Phys. Rev. Lett. **32** (1974) 438; H. Georgi, H. R. Quinn and S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **33** (1974) 451; A. J. Buras, J. Ellis, M. K. Gaillard and D. V. Nanopoulos, Nucl. Phys. **B 135** (1978) 66.
- [2] T. Goldman and D. G. Ross, Nucl. Phys. **B 162** (1980) 102.
- [3] Y. Fugimoto, Phys. Lett. **B 9** (1980) 347; S. Rajpoot, Phys. Rev. **D 22** (1980) 2244; F. del Aguila and L. E. Ibáñez, Nucl. Phys. **B 177** (1981) 60; R. N. Mohapatra and G. Senjanović, Phys. Rev. **D 27** (1983) 1601; B. Brahmachari, U. Sarkar and K. Sridhar, Phys. Lett. **B 297** (1992) 105.
- [4] S. Dimopoulos, S. Raby and F. Wilczek, Phys. Rev. **D 24** (1981) 1681; L. Ibáñez and G. Ross, Phys. Lett. **B 105** (1982) 439; M. B. Einhorn and D. R. T. Jones, Nucl. Phys. **B 196** (1982) 475; W. J. Marciano and G. Senjanović, Phys. Rev. **D 25** (1982) 3092; U. Amaldi, A. Bohm, L. Durkin, P. Langacker, A. Mann, W. Marciano, A. Sirlin and H. Williams, Phys. Rev. **D 36** (1987) 1385; J. Ellis, S. Kelley and D. V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Lett. **B 249** (1990) 441; U. Amaldi, W. de Boer and H. Furstenau, Phys. Lett. **B 260** (1991) 447; P. Langacker and M. Luo, Phys. Rev. **D 44** (1991) 817.
- [5] N. G. Deshpande, E. Keith and T. G. Rizzo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70** (1993) 3189; E. Ma, Phys. Rev. **D 51** (1995) 236; Phys. Lett. **B 344** (1995) 164; S. P. Martin and P. Ramond, Phys. Rev. **D 51** (1995) 6515; M. Bando, J. Sato and T. Takahashi, Phys. Rev. **D 52** (1995) 3076; D. Lee and R. Mohapatra, Phys. Rev. **D 52** (1995) 4125; R. Hempfling, Phys. Lett. **B 351** (1995) 206; B. Brahmachari and R. Mohapatra, Phys. Lett. **B 357** (1995) 566; M. Bastero-Gil and B. Brahmachari, preprint hep-ph/9602391 (1996) (to appear in Nucl. Phys. **B**); N. G. Deshpande, B. Dutta and E. Keith, preprint hep-ph/9605386 (1996).
- [6] H. Georgi and D. V. Nanopoulos, Nucl. Phys. **B 155** (1979) 52; Nucl. Phys. **B 159**

- (1979) 16; K. Babu and S. Barr, Phys. Rev. **D 48** (1993) 5354; Phys. Rev. **D 50** (1994) 3529; Phys. Rev. **D 51** (1995) 2463; D. Lee and R. Mohapatra, Phys. Lett. **B 324** (1994) 376; Phys. Rev. **D 51** (1995) 1353; G. Anderson, S. Dimopoulos, L. Hall, S. Raby and G. Starkman, Phys. Rev. **D 49** (1994) 3660; L. Hall and S. Raby, Phys. Rev. **D 51** (1995) 6524; K. Babu and R. Mohapatra, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74** (1995) 2418.
- [7] F. Anselmo, L. Cifarelli, A. Peterman and A. Zichichi, Nuovo Cimento **A 104** (1991) 1817; G. G. Ross and R. G. Roberts, Nucl. Phys. **B 377** (1992) 571; P. Langacker and N. Polonsky, Phys. Rev. **D 47** (1993) 4028; M. Carena, S. Pokorski and C. E. M. Wagner, Nucl. Phys. **B 406** (1993) 59.
- [8] P. Nath and R. Arnowitt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69** (1992) 725; Phys. Lett. **B 287** (1992) 89; J. Hisano, H. Murayama and T. Yanagida, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69** (1992) 1014; Nucl. Phys. **B 402** (1993) 46; J. L. Lopez, D. V. Nanopoulos, H. Pois and A. Zichichi, Phys. Lett. **B 299** (1993) 262.
- [9] V. Barger, M. S. Berger and P. Ohmann, Phys. Rev. **D 47** (1993) 1093; D. Castano, E. J. Piard and P. Ramond, Phys. Rev. **D 49** (1994) 4882; G. L. Kane, C. Kolda, L. Roszkowski and J. Wells, Phys. Rev. **D 49** (1994) 6173; M. Carena, L. Clavelli, D. Metalliotakis, H. -P. Nilles and C. Wagner, Phys. Lett. **B 317** (1993) 346; L. Clavelli and P. W. Coulter, Phys. Rev. **D 51** (1995) 3913; M. Bastero-Gil and B. Brahmachari, Phys. Rev. **D 54** (1996) 1063.
- [10] H. Georgi and D. Politzer, Phys. Rev. **D 14** (1976) 1829; D. A. Ross, Nucl. Phys. **B 140** (1978) 1; T. Goldman and D. A. Ross, Nucl. Phys. **B 171** (1980) 272; T. Binoth and J. J. van der Bij, Z Phys. **C 58** (1993) 581.
- [11] L. Clavelli and P. W. Coulter, preprint hep-ph/9507261 (1995).
- [12] D. C. Kennedy and B. W. Lynn, Nucl. Phys. **B 322** (1989) 1; B. W. Lynn, preprint SU-ITP-93-22 (1993); M. Kuroda, B. Moulhaka and D. Schildknecht, Nucl. Phys. **B 350**

(1991) 73.

- [13] H. J. Lu and S. Brodsky, Phys. Rev. **D 48** (1993) 3310; G. Grunberg, Phys. Rev. **D 29** (1984) 2315;
- [14] M. Bastero-Gil and J. Pérez-Mercader, Nucl. Phys. **B 450** (1995) 21; Phys. Lett. **B 322** (1994) 355.
- [15] A. Faraggi and B. Grinstein, Nucl. Phys. **B 422** (1994) 3.
- [16] J. Bagger, K. Matchev and D. Pierce, Phys. Lett. **B 348** (1995) 443; P. H. Chankowski, Z. Pluciennik and S. Pokorski, Nucl. Phys. **B 439** (1995) 23; R. Barbieri, P. Ciafaloni and A. Strumia, Nucl. Phys. **B 442** (1995) 461.
- [17] S. Eidelman and F. Jegerlehner, Z Phys. **C 67** (1995) 585; H. Burkhardt and Pietrzyk, Phys. Lett. **B 356** (1995) 398; M. L. Swartz, Phys. Rev. **D 53** (1996) 5268. For a review on different determinations of $\Delta\alpha_{hadrons}^{(5)}(m_Z)$ see for example, T. Takeuchi, preprint CERN-TH/96-79, hep-ph/9603415 (1996).
- [18] B. A. Kniehl, Nucl. Phys. **B 347** (1990) 86; S. Fanchiotti, B. Kniehl and A. Sirlin, Phys. Rev. **D 48** (1993) 307.
- [19] G. Degrossi, S. Fanchiotti and A. Sirlin, Nucl. Phys. **B 351** (1991) 49.
- [20] W. J. Marciano and A. Sirlin, Phys. Rev. **D 22** (1980) 2695; B. W. Lynn and R. G. Stuart, Nucl. Phys. **B 253** (1985) 216; B. Grzadkowski et al., Nucl. Phys. **B 281** (1987) 18. For the susy contributions, see for example P. H. Chankowski et al., Nucl. Phys. **B 417** (1994) 101.
- [21] M. Kuroda, B. Moulhaka and D. Schildknecht, Nucl. Phys. **B 350** (1991) 73.
- [22] CDF Collaboration, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74** (1995) 2626; D0 Collaboration, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74** (1995) 2632.
- [23] Particle Data Group, Phys. Rev. **D 50** (1994) 1.

- [24] T. Goldman and D. A. Ross in [10].
- [25] S. G. Gorishny, A. L. Kataev and S. A. Larin, *Nuovo Cimento* **A 92** (1986) 119; *Phys. Lett.* **B 259** (1991) 144.
- [26] S. Brodsky, G. P. Lepage and P. B. Mackenzie, *Phys. Rev.* **D 28** (1983) 228; S. Brodsky and H. J. Lu, *Phys. Rev.* **D 48** (1993) 3310; *Phys. Rev.* **D 51** (1995) 3652; S. J. Brodsky, G. T. Gabadadze, A. L. Kataev and H. J. Lu, *Phys. Lett.* **B 372** (1996) 133.
- [27] R. Marshall, *Z Phys.* **C 43** (1989) 595.
- [28] W. Celmaster and R. J. Gonsalves, *Phys. Rev.* **D 6** (1979) 1420.
- [29] R. Coquereaux, *Phys. Rev.* **D 23** (1981) 1365.
- [30] W. Fischler, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 129** (1977) 157; A. Billoire, *Phys. Lett.* **B 92** (1980) 343; W. Buchmuller, G. Grunberg and S.-H. H. Tye, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **45** (1980) 103; *ibid* 45 (1980) 587 (**E**).
- [31] W. J. Marciano and A. Sirlin, *Phys. Rev.* **D 22** (1980) 2695; D. C. Kennedy and B. W. Lynn, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 322** (1989) 1.
- [32] F. Anselmo, L. Cifarelli, A. Peterman and A. Zichichi, *Nuovo Cimento* **A 105** (1992) 1025.
- [33] S. Weinberg, *Phys. Lett.* **B 91** (1980) 51; N.-P. Chang, A. Das and J. Pérez-Mercader, *Phys. Lett.* **B 93** (1980) 137; *Phys. Rev.* **D 22** (1980) 1414; C. H. Llewellyn Smith, G. G. Ross and J. F. Wheather, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 177** (1981) 263; L. Hall, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 178** (1981) 75; P. Binétruy and T. Schüker, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 178** (1981) 307.
- [34] A. Masiero, D. V. Nanopoulos, K. Tamvakis and T. Yanagida, *Phys. Lett.* **B 115** (1982) 380; B. Grinstein, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 206** (1982) 387.
- [35] K. Hagiwara and Y. Yamada, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70** (1993) 709; Y. Yamada, *Z Phys.* **C 60** (1993) 83; J. Hisano, T. Moroi, K. Kobe and T. Yanagida, *Phys. Lett.* **B 342** (1995)

138; L. Clavelli and P. W. Coulter, Phys. Rev. **D 51** (1995) 3913; J. L. Lopez and D. V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Rev. **D 53** (1996) 2670.

- [36] M. Bastero–Gil and B. Brahmachari in [9].
- [37] C. T. Hill, Phys. Lett. **B 135** (1984) 47; Q. Shafi and C. Wetterich, Phys. Rev. Lett. **52** (1984) 875; J. Ellis, K. Enqvist, D. V. Nanopoulos and K. Tamvakis, Phys. Lett. **B 155** (1985) 381; M. Drees, Phys. Lett. **B 158** (1985) 409; Phys. Rev. **D 33** (1986) 1468; P. Langacker and N. Polonsky in [7]; L. J. Hall and U. Sarid, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70** (1993) 2673.
- [38] T. Dasgupta, P. Mames and P. Nath, Phys. Rev. **D 52** (1995) 5366; D. Ring, S. Urano and R. Arnowitt, Phys. Rev. **D 52** (1995) 6623.
- [39] For recent works on unification with extra matter see K. S. Babu and J. C. Pati, preprint hep-ph/9606215 (1996); C. Kolda and J. March–Russell, preprint hep-ph/9609480 (1996). One of the remarkable consequences of adding extra matter is that the unification scale is pushed upwards closer to the expectation from string theory $M_{string} \approx 5 \times 10^{17} GeV$.
- [40] J. E. Bjorkman and D. R. T. Jones, Nucl. Phys. **B 259** (1995) 533.